DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 022 CS 508 429

AUTHOR Danielson, Mary Ann; Hollwitz, John
TITLE Evaluating Directors of Forensics: A Job Analysis Approach.
PUB DATE Nov 93
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (79th, Miami Beach, FL, November 18-21, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Effectiveness; *Administrator Evaluation; Communication Research; Construct Validity; *Debate; *Evaluation Criteria; Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; National Surveys; Performance Factors
IDENTIFIERS Debate Tournaments

ABSTRACT

A preliminary study tested the reliability and validity of an instrument that was constructed to identify and measure the various dimensions, tasks, and worker characteristics associated with performing the functions of a director of forensics. Three-part questionnaires were mailed to 210 forensics programs, representing both public and private institutions of varying sizes, and all types of forensics programs. Sixty-three of 205 deliverable surveys were returned, for a response rate of 31%. Results indicated that the instrument: (1) must include the fine "essential" dimensions (accounting and bookkeeping, administering the speech/debate program, arranging students' participation in off-campus tournaments, coaching speech/debate participants, and recruiting students for the speech/debate program); (2) should include the three "relevant" dimensions (directing on-campus tournaments; counseling and advising speech/debate students; and teaching a speech/debate class); and (3) may include the two "possibly relevant" dimensions (college/university and community service involvement, and moderating speech/debate student groups). Utilizing the write-in responses as a preliminary test of validity, the instrument was determined to have a high content validity. Findings suggest that the evaluation instrument appears to be generalizable to all types of programs in all types and sizes of institutions. (Two tables of data are included; 17 references and the questionnaire used to test the evaluation instrument are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 366 022

Evaluating Directors of Forensics: A Job Analysis Approach

by
Mary Ann Danielson
Instructor
Creighton University

and
Dr. John Hollwitz
Associate Professor
Creighton University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Presented at
Speech Communication Association's
National Convention
November, 1993

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Danielson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

CS508429

Special thanks to Dr. Ann Burnett Pettus for her comments on an earlier version of this paper.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Evaluating Directors of Forensics: A Job Analysis Approach

> People in forensics can be very defensive. Criticisms are frequently regarded as a life or death matter, and to admit any inadequacy or disadvantage might result in the elimination of forensics altogether (Rieke, 1968, p. 59).

The fear of criticism addressed by Rieke (1968) still exists and may explain the overall lack of evaluation and evaluative tools in forensics today. The lack of forensics evaluation seems especially prevalent at the administrative level. While forensics educators may concede that the evaluation of students' performances, judges' ballots, or trends in forensics activities is necessary, very few forensics educators/researchers have turned the evaluative spotlight on themselves--the Directors of Forensics (DOFs).

Given increasing societal and educational pressure for accountability, DOFs are forced to address, at least minimally, the issue of evaluating the forensics educator's performance. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to address the evaluation of DOFs by providing a historical background on forensics evaluation, introducing the job assessment approach to evaluating forensics, outlining the initial results of a survey testing the reliability and validity of a job assessment instrument, and concluding with a discussion of the study's implications for the forensics community.

Evaluating Directors of Forensics

Historically, the evaluation of the DOF's performance was addressed via the traditional university standards for promotion and/or tenure. Conferees, at the 1974 Sedalia Conference, recommended that "the forensics educator should meet the department and institutional criteria for promotion, tenure and compensation. . . . They [forensics educators] should not be held to

higher standards, nor do they seek lower standards" (Definitional statement, 1974, p. 47). Whereas no one in forensics is arguing for lower evaluation standards, disagreement does exist on the criterion or criteria utilized for evaluation.

While the Sedalia Conference's conclusion, that "the primary criterion for evaluating the performance of the forensics educator should be teaching effectiveness, including the directing of forensics as a teaching function" (Definitional statement, 1974, p. 47), has been generally supported (Boileau, 1990), not all forensics educators agree. Some DOFs recognize that forensics activities cut across all three areas of traditional (although not universal) academic evaluation: teaching, scholarship and service, and they argue that evaluations should reflect their contributions in each of these three areas. Dudczak (1985) summarizes best the paradox inherent in this paradigm when he states:

> They [DOFs] have a unique assignment which cuts across all three areas of the traditional categories for promotion and tenure, yet their evaluation either categorizes their efforts within a single category [usually service which is weighted the least in tenure and promotion decisions], or understates it by making quantitative comparisons of output without cognizance of assignment load [assigned loads given to forensics, if one is given at all, is typically in the range of 1/4 to 1/3 of an appointment, while the actual load of the forensics assignment required by the activity is upwards of 2/3 to 3/4 assignment]. In either case the forensics educator often finds his/her relative evaluation diminished in comparison with department peers. (pp. 10-11)

Position papers presented at the Second National Conference on Forensics (1984) reflect the attitude that it is in the forensics educators' best interest to develop some form of evaluation which would recognize the various contributions made by the DOFs. Congalton states,

> . . . . forensics coaches must work to ensure that they are receiving credit for the many

> tasks which they perform. When the forensics specialist is called upon to serve numerous roles, ranging from coach to administrator, then some value should be placed on all the tasks which a forensics coach carries out. Evaluation committees should be made aware of the totality of a forensics coach's responsibilities. Only then, will forensics educators be given credit for the many tasks which they are called upon to perform. (Dudczak & Zarefsky, 1984, p. 33)

Despite the perceived need for a promotion and tenure instrument, the end result of the (1984) Conference was only a listing of possible criteria for evaluation.

"The [1984] document provides a sound basis for the evaluation of DOFs if the departments, colleges, and universities are willing to adapt their procedures and evaluations to individual cases. Again, there is no data to suggest that such is the case, and . . . [DOFs] are no better off than before" (Richardson, 1991, p. 4). What we have seen since 1984 is increasing role tensions, decreasing life [career] expectancy of a DOF [58% of all DOFs are in their first five years of coaching, only 20% of DOFs coach more than 10 years], and shortchanging of educational goals (Dudczak, 1985; Richardson, 1991). The need for a specialized evaluation instrument appears to be especially important for the DOF in the 1990s.

The need for forensics evaluation has not diminished. If anything, it has increased. Schmalz (1989) observes that "the complicated process of assessing faculty productivity is perhaps the most exasperating task facing higher education today" (B2). The public sector agrees. The pursuit of effective performance appraisal occupies most organizations in the public section. Equal employment legislation and court decisions will make this pursuit even more important in coming years (Bernardin & Beatty, 1984). The educational accountability movement will impose further pressure upon higher education. The forensics community will not likely be exempt. Albert (1991) argues that forensics practitioners and administrators

should provide (university) administrators with some consensus about the guidelines for evaluation. "From an administrative standpoint, the challenge of considering forensics is the challenge of evaluating forensics activities in which faculty members participate. Administrators would benefit if forensics practitioners and administrators could develop some consensus about the guidelines which should be used to evaluate the forensics work of faculty members" (Albert, 1991, p. 7). Because evaluation at the college and university level will continue, there exists a need for an evaluative instrument that reflects the true dimensions of DOFs.

Job Analysis

Borrowing from industrial/organizational assessment, an evaluation instrument was constructed (Hollwitz & Danielson, 1992) to identify and measure the various dimensions, tasks, and worker characteristics associated with performing the functions of the DOF. The instrument was based on the three attributes used in job analysis and assessment: Knowledge, Skills and Abilities (usually referred to as KSAs). These three attributes are defined by the Uniform Guidelines (1978) as: Knowledge is the body of information pertinent to a job; Skills are the psychomotor capabilities (ability to perform basic skills or functions of the job); and Abilities are a behavioral competence. Although the potential for overlapping areas does exist and has been noted, KSAs are important as they provide a way to customize selection and classification procedures.

Job analysis has multiple purposes which include personnel administration, the reduction of exposure to legal liability, and (as in our case) an increase in understanding of and evaluation for a specific academic position. Regardless of purpose, legal precedent insists that three guidelines should be followed in constructing a job analysis. These guidelines mandate that

(a) the job analysis should be based on the specific tasks of the position, clearly linked to any worker characteristics (such as KSAs) to be used in evaluation; (b) the tasks that emerge from the analysis must be demonstratably 'critical' (i.e., high scoring on measures of frequency and importance); and (c) the analysis should rely on multiple sources of information about the position (Arvey & Faley, 1988; Hogan & Quigleyk, 1986; Kleiman & Faley, 1985).

Keeping these guidelines in mind, the specific job analysis process uses three steps or stages. (For a more complete description of the creation process, see Hollwitz & Danielson, 1992.) In stage one, job experts who had served as debate and forensics directors identified important tasks and dimensions. Ten overall dimensions emerged through interviews, archival materials and the Managerial and Professional Job Functions Inventory (MPJFI), a standardized job analysis measure (Baehr, Lonergan, & Hunt, 1988). In stage two, job experts rated tasks associated with these dimensions for their criticality (based on those which are most important for the job, occupy the greatest amount of time on the job, or both). Ninety-two tasks (68%) reached the cutoff criterion for importance or frequency. In stage three, job experts used the final list of tasks and dimensions to derive a list of requisite worker characteristics. These characteristics are the KSAs, and they provide a way to customize selection and describe satisfactory performance in a position.

In completing the three stages, the following ten dimensions were identified: accounting and bookkeeping; administering the speech/debate program; arranging students' participation in off-campus tournaments; coaching speech/debate participants; college/university and community service involvement; counseling and advising speech/debate students; directing on-campus tournaments; moderating speech/debate student group(s); recruiting students for the speech/debate program; and teaching a speech/debate class(es). Each dimension has various tasks associated with it. For example, the tasks associated with accounting and bookkeeping

included knowledge of basic accounting principles, knowledge of university bookkeeping procedures, and skill at double-entry bookkeeping. [See Appendix A for a complete listing of the dimensions (Part I) and KSAs (Part II).]

Once an instrument is created, however, there exists the need to test it. Dudczak and Zarefsky (1984) stated that " developing a prototype of an instrument is but the first step toward what is needed. Instruments must [then] be evaluated for validity and reliability as well as face validity" (p.30) . As the 1992 instrument has yet to be tested, a preliminary survey was conducted to test its reliability and validity.

METHOD

Survey Instrument Design

Utilizing the 1992 instrument as the prototype, a three part questionnaire was constructed to assess the reliability and validity of the instrument. Part one identified the ten dimensions and asked the respondents to rank, on a three-point Likert scale, how critical each dimension was in conducting their job (1= not essential, 2= moderately essential, and 3= essential), and list a task(s) associated with that dimension. Respondents were provided the opportunity to "write in" additional dimensions (those not previously cited within the original ten) that they believed to be essential to their job. To avoid the possibility of respondents falling into a "response set" (rating the tasks at the same level as the controlling dimension), tasks associated with the various dimensions were separated into their respective Knowledge, Skills, and Abilities categories and listed in Part two.

Part two of the questionnaire addressed the different forms of Knowledge, Skills, Abilities, and Worker Characteristics. Respondents were asked to rate each of the items (tasks) three times: once, for the importance of the item for job success (1= minor importance for

success, 2= average importance for success, and 3= high importance for success); once, for the difficulty associated with learning the task on the job (1 = easily learned, 2= average difficulty in learning, and 3= difficult to learn); and once, for the importance of having this feature of the job on the first day of work (1= little importance, 2= average importance, and 3= high importance).

Part three of the questionnaire asked the respondents to provide demographic information about the type of institution (private; public, 2-year; and public, 4-year), size of institution, type of program (speech, debate, or some form of joint program), and size of program (measured by number of participants, staffing, and travel budget). [A complete copy of the survey may be found in Appendix A].

Respondents

Surveys were mailed to 210 forensics programs, representing both public and private institutions, of varying sizes, and all types of forensics programs (speech only, debate only, and various forms of joint speech/debate). Forensics programs were selected from the mailing list generated for a joint speech/debate tournament and represented a national scope.

Five surveys were returned undeliverable or indicating that a program no longer existed at that institution. Sixty-three of the remaining 205 surveys were completed and returned for a response rate of 31%. (While a 38% response rate was sought, the lower-than-expected return may be due to the timing of the survey. Surveys were mailed in mid-March with a response requested by early April. The timing of this survey conflicted with year-end travel to district and national tournaments.) Six coders were trained to transfer survey data to computer scantron sheets. A review of six surveys (approximately 10%) found an error rate of only .004 (.4%).

Data Analysis

The dimensions were evaluated, using the mean ($\bar{x}$) scores of the responses, according to the following scale: dimensions with means of 2.5 or greater (on a 3.0 scale) were considered "essential" dimensions; dimensions with means of 2.0-2.49 (on a 3.0 scale) were considered "relevant" dimensions; and dimensions with means below 2.0 (on a 3.0 scale) were considered "possible" dimensions. Additionally, analyses of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to determine if the dimensions varied significantly by type of institution, size of institution, or type of program.

Finally, the data were analyzed for measurement validity using the following two criteria: (a) measurement reliability, as measured by a Cronbach's alpha, and (b) content validity, as measured by the association between the tasks respondents listed for the various dimensions and the tasks generated by the original instrument designers (136 possible tasks for the ten dimensions).

RESULTS

As Table 1 indicates, eight of the original ten dimensions achieved means ($\bar{x}$) of 2.0 or higher (on the 3.0 scale). The five "essential" dimensions ($\bar{x}$ of 2.5 or higher) of the DOF's position included (in rank order by mean): arranging students' participation in off-campus tournaments; administering the speech/debate program; coaching speech/debate participants; accounting and bookkeeping; and recruiting students for the speech/debate program. Three "relevant" dimensions ($\bar{x}$ of 2.0-2.49) of the the DOF's position included (in rank order by mean): directing on-campus tournaments; teaching a speech/debate class; and counseling and advising speech/debate students. The two original dimensions that are "possibly" relevant to all programs ($\bar{x}$ of less than 2.0) included: college/university and community service involvement

(1.97) and moderating speech/debate student group(s) (1.59).

Table 1 goes about here

Under the OTHER dimension, respondents "wrote in" an additional eight items. The eight items (number of responses following) included: researching topics/cuttings (1); public relations (3); assessing campus involvement (1); handling social/emotional difficulties (1); recruiting graduate students for staffing (1); and supervising Directors of Individual Events and Debate (1). All eight items could be classified as tasks under one of the original ten dimensions. Specifically, researching topics/cuttings is considered part of coaching speech/debate participants; public relations and campus involvement is subsumed under college/university and community service; social/emotional difficulties is included in counseling students; and the issue of graduate students and Directors of Individual Events and Debate are a part of administering a forensics program.

As Table 2 indicates, data were provided by a wide range of respondents which were charactized by type and size of institution, and type and size of program. Approximately three-fourths (77%) of the respondents were affiliated with public institutions. Over 90% of the respondents represented institutions of at least 1,000 students.

Table 2 goes about here

All types of programs were represented in this study. The majority of the programs (57%) were joint speech/debate programs. The types of debate represented included National Debate Tournament (NDT), Cross-Examination Debate Association (CEDA), Parliamentary, and

Lincoln-Douglas (L-D). For purposes of tabulation, if a school identified itself as either "both debate (L-D) and speech" or as "speech only," but listed L-D debate, it was classified as speech with L-D debate (a newly created category). [The survey's original categorization scheme did not account for individual events programs that include L-D debate, as does the National Forensics Association's National Tournament.] Speech-only programs comprised 20% of the sample, followed by debate-only programs (15%) and speech with L-D debate programs (8%).

The size of the program was measured using number of participants, staffing, and travel budget. Respondents represented programs of every size, as program size ranged from "less than five" competitors (7%) to "over 40" competitors (12%). Various combinations of staffing existed in these programs. Staffing involved full-time faculty, part-time faculty, graduate teaching assistants, and paid assistants. Full-time only staffs (35%), closely followed by joint full-time staffs with graduate teaching assistants (30%), comprised the predominant form(s) of staffing. The average staff size (165 total staff identified/62 programs) was 2.66 members. Travel budgets varied greatly across program, with the budgets ranging from $2,500 to $70,000. The majority of the programs (55%) had travel budgets of less than $20,000 (many respondents noted that their budgets were "not enough").

Results showed little difference in response attributable to program type, institutional type or institutional size. One dimension, "arranging students' participation in off-campus tournaments," showed differences across institutions of different sizes ($F[4, 56] = 3.35$, $p < .05$). Post-hoc analyses using the Student-Newman-Keuls procedure showed that institutions which enrolled fewer than 20,000 students rated this dimension as more essential than did institutions with greater than 20,000 ($p<.05$). No additional differences emerged among subgroups of institutions with fewer than 20,000 students.

The reliability of the measures was assessed using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. A

reliability score of .95 was achieved. Further, respondents provided strong initial evidence of the content validity of dimensions and tasks. In their responses to individual dimensions, respondents collectively listed 457 tasks of 630 that could possibly have been listed from 63 completed forms, each with ten dimensions, a 72.5% completion rate.

These tasks strongly suggested that the original job analysis had acceptable content validity. Of those 457 tasks which respondents volunteered, 99% were associated with the same dimension that had emerged in the original form. This rate of agreement vastly exceeds the 60% to 70% acceptability standard usually accepted as part of the 'retranslation method" (Smith & Kendall, 1963), by which job analysts commonly approximate a cross-validation of dimension and task associations.

Five tasks were erroneously linked to dimensions. Four of these were associated with "college/university and community service involvement." Tasks erroneously included in this dimension were committee work and support of colleagues.

DISCUSSION

This study described the development and initial validation of a job analysis for forensics program directors. A sample of current forensics directors provided evidence that the prototype for forensics evaluation, according to the results of this study, must include the five dimensions of accounting and bookkeeping, administering the speech/debate program, arranging students' participation in off-campus tournaments, coaching speech/debate participants, and recruiting students for the speech/debate program; should include the three dimensions of directing on-campus tournaments, counseling and advising speech/debate students, and teaching a speech/debate class(es); and may include the two dimensions of college/university and

community service involvement and moderating speech/debate student groups. Institutions of less than than 20,000 students should also note the importance of "arranging students' participation in off-campus tournaments." The special significance of this particular dimension for smaller institutions may be the result of smaller staffing and budgets. With fewer staff-hours and travel dollars, arranging for off-campus tournaments may consume a greater proportion of the staff's time. Therefore, this dimension may be considered more critical for job performance and rated more essential.

Despite the measurement's reliability and the overall lack of variance associated with institutions and programs, to generalize the findings, the instrument must also be valid. While more detailed, quantitative tests need to be conducted for construct validity, "the first way a researcher can establish content validity is to make sure that the measurement instrument reflects the construct as it is defined conceptually" (Frey, Botan, Friedman, & Kreps, 1991, p. 122). Utilizing the write-in responses (listing of tasks for each of the ten dimensions) as a preliminary test of validity, 99% of the responses were congruent with tasks associated with the respective dimensions as determined by the researchers. Therefore, the instrument was determined to have high content validity.

The study has limitations which subsequent research should address. The first of these was the highly select sample which responded to the survey. The response rate of approximately 30%, while not unusual in survey-based research, is likely to produce a suboptimal sample.

The analysis suggests the adequacy of the identified performance dimensions for the positon of forensics director, almost all of them independent of institutional or program type. If so, the dimensions and the instrument are likely transportable and useful for assessment purposes. However, further research should confirm that the consistency detected in the

instrument is stable and not a byproduct of sampling bias, especially if the dimensions are to be used for performance assessment or selection.

Finally, the dimensions' utility may not be restricted to assessment. If the dimensions are sound, they can be used to provide important information for selecting or developing forensics directors (i.e. To what degree does the candidate have experience in administering programs, familiarity with accounting principles, etc.? How much additional training will this candidate/director need to successfully complete the job?). Further research can explore the extent to which ratings of experience or potential on these dimensions can effectively help schools predict the effectiveness of their forensics directors.

While the evaluation form appears to be generalizable to all types of programs in all types and sizes of institutions, each program must personalize these dimensions/tasks so as to best reflect the mission and goals of that program, department, and/or college or university. It is hoped, through the dissemination and use of this forensics evaluation instrument, that administrators and DOFs alike will have an increased understanding of and clearer evaluative tool for the activity we call forensics.

References

Albert, L. S. (1991). Forensics as scholarly activity from the administrative perspective. (Contract No. CS-507-682). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Arvey, R. D., & Faley, R. H. (1988). Fairness in selecting employees. (2nd ed.) Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Baehr, M. E., Lonergan, W. G., & Hunt, B. A. (1988). The managerial and professional job functions inventory. Park Ridge: London House, Inc.

Bernardin, H. J., & Beatty, R. W. (1984). Performance appraisal: Assessing human behavior at work. Boston: Kent.

Boileau, D. M. (1990). The role of department chair as forensics promoter. National Forensics Journal, 8, 87-94.

Definitional statement. (1974). Forensics as communication: The argumentative perspective (pp. 11-49). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Dudczak, C. A. (1985). Philosophy and reality at a research university. (Contract No. CS-505-097). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Dudczak, C. A., & Zarefsky, D. (1984). Promotions and tenure standards. In D. Parson (Ed.) American Forensics in Perspective: Papers from the Second National Conference on Forensics (pp. 23-35). Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association.

Frey, L. R., Botan, C. H., Friedman, P. G., & Kreps, G. L. (1991). Investigating communication: An introduction to research methods. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hogan, J., & Quigleyk, A. M. (1986). Physical standards for employment and the courts. American Psychologist, 41, 1193-1217.

Hollwitz, J., & Danielson, M. A. (1992). Industrial assessment in higher education: Applying job analysis to faculty and administrative performance. In T. W. Banta and Anderson (Eds.) Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Assessing Quality in Higher Education (pp. 361-372). Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis.

Kleiman, L. S., & Faley, R. H. (1985). The implications of professional and legal guidelines for court decisions involving criterion-related validity: A review and analysis. Personnel Psychology, 38, 803-833.

Richardson, L. S. (1991). Competing academic priorities and the director of forensics: Do we need a broader definition of scholarship? (Contract No. Cs-507-845). Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Rieke, R. D. (1968). A philosophy of forensics. In D. F. Faules & R. D. Rieke (Eds.) Directing forensics: Debate and contest speaking (pp. 33-78). Scranton, PA: Internatinal Textbook Company.

Schmalz, R. F. (1989, January 18). Many artist-teachers are penalized by colleges' current procedures for evaluating faculty productivity. Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. B1-B2.

Smith, P. C., & Kendall, L. M. (1963). Retranslation of expectations: An approach to the construction of unambiguous anchors for rating scales. Journal of Applied Psychology, 47, 149-155.

Uniform guidelines on employee selection procedures. (1978). Federal Register, 43, 38290-38315.

Table 1
DIMENSIONS

	MEAN ($\bar{x}$)
ACCOUNTING AND BOOKKEEPING	2.74**
ADMINISTERING THE SPEECH/DEBATE PROGRAM	2.92**
ARRANGING STUDENTS' PARTICIPATION IN OFF-CAMPUS TOURNAMENTS	2.94**
COACHING SPEECH/DEBATE PARTICIPANTS	2.87**
COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY SERVICE INVOLVEMENT	1.97
COUNSELING AND ADVISING SPEECH/DEBATE STUDENTS	2.32*
DIRECTING ON-CAMPUS TOURNAMENTS	2.38*
MODERATING SPEECH/DEBATE STUDENT GROUP	1.59
RECRUITING STUDENTS FOR THE SPEECH/DEBATE PROGRAM	2.55**
TEACHING A SPEECH/DEBATE CLASS	2.35*

**Essential Dimensions (defined by a $\bar{x}$ of 2.5 or greater [possible 3.0]).
* Relevant Dimensions (defined by a $\bar{x}$ of 2.0 or greater [possible 3.0]).

Table 2
DEMOGRAPHICS*

1. Type of Institution

A. private	14 (23%)
B. 2 year	6 (10%)
C. 4 year	40 (67%)

2. Size of Institution

A. less than 1,000 students	5 (8%)
B. 1,001-5,000	19 (31%)
C. 5,001-10,000	12 (20%)
D. 10,001-20,000	15 (25%)
E. over 20,000	10 (16%)

3. Type of Program

A. speech only	12 (20%)
B. speech with LD	5 (8%)
C. Debate only	9 (15%)
D. Both speech and Debate	34(57%)

4. Size of Program

A. 0-5	4 (7%)
B. 6-10	11(19%)
C. 11-20	21 (36%)
D. 21-30	8 (13%)
E. 31-40	8 (13%)
F. over 40	7 (12%)

5. Program Staffing:

Full-time only programs	22 (35%)
Part-time only programs	3 (5%)
Graduate Assistants only	2 (3%)
F-T and P-T programs	8 (13%)
F-T and GTA	19 (30%)
F-T and Paid Assts.	5 (8%)

Totals:
70 Full time
27 Part-time
62 Graduate Teaching Assistants
6 Paid Assistants

6. Budgets (Travel) Range: $2,500-$70,000

17	under $10,000
17	$10,000-19,999
17	$20,000-29,999
5	$30,000-39,999
2	$40,000-49,999
2	$over 50,000

*Demographic information reflects responses from 59-62 programs, as not all programs completed all information. One program left all of Part three blank.

Appendix A

QUESTIONNAIRE

PART I: Rate how essential you perceive the following dimensions to be in conducting your Director of Forensics job. Additionally, list an activity or activities you associate with that aspect of the job.

1=not essential to my job 2=moderately essential to my job 3= essential to my job

1. Accounting and Bookkeeping 1 2 3

   List a task or tasks you associate with this dimension _____

2. Administering the speech/debate program 1 2 3

   List a task or tasks you associate with this dimension_____

3. Arranging students' participation in off-campus tournament 1 2 3

   List a task or tasks you associate with this dimension_____

4. Coaching speech/debate participants 1 2 3

   List a task or tasks you associate with this dimension_____

5. College/University and community service involvement 1 2 3

   List a task or tasks you associate with this dimension_____

6. Counseling and advising speech/debate students 1 2 3

   List a task or tasks you associate with this dimension_____

7. Directing on-campus tournaments 1 2 3

   List a task or tasks you associate with this dimension_____

8. Moderating speech/debate student group(s) 1 2 3

   List a task or tasks you associate with this dimension_____

9. Recruiting students for the speech/debate program 1 2 3

   List a task or tasks you associate with this dimension_____

10. Teaching a speech/debate class(es) 1 2 3

    List a task or tasks you associate with this dimension_____

11. Other: _____ 1 2 3

OVER

PART II: On the next few pages, you will find a number of items that represent different forms of Knowledge, Skills, Abilities and Worker Characteristics (KSAW). All of these items are tasks associated with the position of Director of Forensics. Please rate each of these KSAW items. Each task should be rated three times (once for importance for job success, once for difficulty to learn on the job, and once for importance in having the first day on the job), using the three point scales located next to the item. The scales have the following meaning:

IMPORTANCE FOR SUCCESS refers to how critical each of the items is: To what extent someone hired as Director of Forensics need to have the KSAW described to be successful on the job?

1= minor importance for job success
2= average importance for job success
3= high importance for job success

If you believe that one of the items has no importance at all for the position, please *cross out* that particular item, and do not circle any numbers for it.

DIFFICULTY TO LEARN ON THE JOB refers to how hard it would be for someone who did not possess each of these features to acquire them, once she or he began working as a Director of Forensics.

1= easily learned on the job
2= average difficulty in learning on the job
3= difficult to learn on the job

If you believe that one of the items is not important at all for the Director of Forensics position, please *cross out* that particular item, and do not circle any numbers for it.

IMPORTANCE TO HAVE ON THE FIRST DAY OF WORK refers to how important it may be for a newly-hired Director of Forensics to have this feature, on the first day of her or his employment. In other words, how important is it that a newly-hired Director of Forensics possess this feature by their first day of work?

1= little importance on the first day of work
2= average importance on the first day of work
3= high importance on the first day of work

If you believe that one of the items is not important at all for the Director of Forensics position, please *cross out* that particular item, and do not circle any numbers for it.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

Rating Scale:
Knowledge, Skills, Abilities and Worker Characteristic

Part One: Knowledge

	Importance for success	Difficulty to learn on job	Importance of having 1st day
1. Knowledge of basic accounting principles.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
2. Knowledge of fair (hiring) employment practices.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
3. Knowledge of federal work-study guidelines.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
4. Knowledge of national forensics rules and regulations.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
5. Knowledge of newspapers or periodicals used in speech/ debate preparation.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
6. Knowledge of readings useful for performance pieces.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
7. Knowledge of campus public safety procedures.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
8. Knowledge of rules regulating speech and debate competitions.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
9. Knowledge of campus funding procedures.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
10. Knowledge of university bookkeeping procedures.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
11. Knowledge of university insurance procedures.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
12. Knowledge of university recruiting and admissions policies.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
13. Knowledge of university student employement practices.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3

OVER

Part Two: Skills

	Importance for success	Difficulty to learn on job	Importance of having 1st day
1. Skill at computing competitiors' scores and ranks.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
2. Skill at double-entry bookkeeping.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
3. Skill at editing literature selections for performance.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
4. Skill at lecturing on speech/ debate topics.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
5. Skill at listening to student concerns.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
6. Skill at operating tournament scheduling software.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
7. Skill at safe driving.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
8. Skill at writing letters of references.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
9. Skill at writing reports.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3

Part Three: Abilities

	Importance for success	Difficulty to learn on job	Importance of having 1st day
1. Ability to assess student proficiency in speech and debate class(es).	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
2. Ability to build good working-group relations.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
3. Ability to conduct rehearsals.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
4. Ability to conduct search for speech/debate assistants.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

Part Three: Abilities continued

	Importance for success	Difficulty to learn on job	Importance of having 1st day
5. Ability to drive different university-owned vehicles. (cars, vans, etc.)	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
6. Ability to formulate team goals.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
7. Ability to identify appropriate selections/topics for use in performances.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
8. Ability to improve participants' morale.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
9. Ability to match participants with competition events.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
10. Ability to motivate subordinates.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3
11. Ability to run speech and debate tournaments.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3

Part Four: Worker Characteristics

	Importance for success	Difficulty to learn on job	Importance of having 1st day
1. Willingness to travel to speech and debate tournaments on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays.	1 2 3	1 2 3	1 2 3

OVER

PART III: Please check the appropriate space concerning the following demographic characteristics of your institution and program.

Type of Institution:

Private _____

Public _____

2-year _____

4-year _____

Size of Institution:

less than 1, 000 students _____

1,001-5,000 students _____

5,001-10,000 students _____

10,001-20,000 students _____

20,000+ students _____

Type of Program

Speech (I.E.) _____

Debate _____ Please specify type(s) of debate: _____

Both Debate and I.E. _____ _____

Number of Participants in the Program:

0-5 _____

6-10 _____

11-20 _____

21-30 _____

31-40 _____

40+ _____

Staffing for Program:(Please indicate number of each type of staff)

Full-time _____

Part-time _____

Graduate Assts. _____

Paid Assts. _____

Budget: Total travel funding for Academic Year 1992-1993: _____

THANK YOU.